REMARKS

Claims 1-4 have been examined and have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second

paragraph and under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

I.   Preliminary Matters

The Examiner has objected to claims 2 and 4 due to informalities. Accordingly,

Applicant has amended the claims in the manner suggested by the Examiner. Applicant

respectfully requests that such amendments be entered for purposes of appeal.

II.   Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as

allegedly being indefinite. Accordingly, Applicant has amended the claims in a manner believed

to overcome the rejection. Since the proposed amendments merely correct antecedent basis

issues, Applicant respectfully requests that the amendments be entered for purposes of appeal.

**III.   Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,624,281 to Mehta et
al. ("Mehta") and U.S. Publication No. 2005/0102527 to Tatebayashi et al. ("Tatebayashi")**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being

unpatentable over Mehta in view of Tatebayashi.

A.   Claim 1

Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over the cited reference. For example, claim

1 recites a peripheral device comprising, "an inputting means for inputting peripheral device

authentication data being the same as the authentication data stored in a storage means of the

programmable logic controller," and "a verification means for determining whether or not use of

the programmable logic controller peripheral device is authorized, by checking peripheral device

authentication data read out from the external storage means and decrypted, against peripheral

device authentication data read out from the internal storage means and decrypted."

In Mehta, an identification input device 52 is provided to input a user's biometric

information for authentication purposes (col. 38-58). As shown in Figure 2A of Mehta, the input

device 52 can be formed as part of the personal computer, or, as shown in Figure 3A, the input

device 52 can be formed remote from the personal computer. Thus, it is assumed that the input

device 52 is alleged to disclose the claimed inputting means. Since claim 1 recites that the

peripheral device comprises the inputting means, the input device 52 of Mehta would therefore

also disclose the claimed peripheral device.

Further to the above, Mehta discloses that authentication of the biometric information

input via the input device 52 is performed in the authentication module/processor 54. The

authentication module/processor 54 is communicatively coupled to the input device 52 (See Fig.

3A; col. 6, lines 43-64). The authentication module/processor 54 includes a storage device 56

that has a database of biometric information associated with authenticated users (col. 6, line 65 to

col. 7, line 1). Thus, the authentication module/processor 54 appears to disclose a type of

verification means as recited in claim 1. As shown in Figure 3A of Mehta and disclosed therein,

however, the authentication module/processor 54 is separate from the input device 52 as opposed

to being part of the input device 52. On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner cites to column 8, lines 43-48 regarding the implementation of certain features as a single component or as multiple components. However, the cited portion is merely directed toward having the authentication module/processor 54, the emulation controller 60, the input-output buffer 64, the operational amplifier buffer 68 and the storage device 56 composed of one single component or multiple components. There is no teaching or suggestion with regard to combining the input device 52 with the authentication module/processor 54. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Mehta fails to disclose a peripheral device having both an inputting means and a verification means as claimed.

Applicant further submits that Tatebayashi fails to cure the deficient teachings of Mehta. For example, while Tatebayashi discloses encryption/decryption of data, the authentication verification is performed in the memory card 200 which is separate from the memory card writer 300 (where the memory card writer was previously alleged to disclose peripheral device) (see paras. [0084], [0114] and [0118], [0128]).

At least based on the foregoing, Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over the cited reference.

B.   Claim 3

Since claim 3 recites features that are analogous to the features recited in claim 1, Applicant submits that claim 3 is patentable for at least analogous reasons as presented above for claim 1.

C.   Claims 2 and 4

Applicant submits that claims 2 and 4 are patentable at least by virtue of their

dependency.

IV.   Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed

to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is

kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue

Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any

overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Allison M. Tulino/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: March 4, 2010

Allison M. Tulino
Registration No. 48,294

9